DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 075 873 CS 500 241

AUTHOR Lashbrook, William; And Others
TITLE A Theoretical Consideration of the Assessment of Source Credibility as a Linear Function of Information Seeking Behavior.
PUB DATE 15 Jul 72
NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (Honolulu, November, 1972)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Information Theory; *Personality Assessment; Personality Studies; Rating Scales; Research Design; *Research Methodology; *Semantic Differential; *Statistical Analysis; Values
IDENTIFIERS *Source Credibility

ABSTRACT

This paper investigated the assumption that a linear relationship could be detected between the process of source credibility evaluation and the seeking of information. The authors utilized twelve semantic differential scales which, when used for evaluating the source credibility of public figures, clustered into four dimensions: competence, character, composure, and extroversion. Seventy students utilized the twelve scales in the evaluation of eight historical political figures, on a stimulus of name only, with no descriptive information. Based on results of the previous evaluations, three of the figures who showed significant differences on the four dimensions were selected for evaluation by another group on three informational levels: name only, information without the name, and with both information and the name. The information was constructed from a questionnaire designed to determine which information was required for source credibility evaluation and how scale items might be interrelated. The results indicate that a relationship does exist between the processes of credibility evaluation itself and the seeking of information to make the evaluations. (Author/RN)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 075873

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A Theoretical Consideration of the Assessment of Source Credibility as a Linear Function of Information Seeking Behavior

by

William Lashbrook
Joyce Daley
Illinois State University

Paul Hamilton
University of Oregon

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
William Lashbrook
Joyce Daley
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Paul Hamilton
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

Submitted to:

Behavioral Science Interest Group
Western States Speech-Communication
Association
July 15, 1972

CS 500 241

A Theoretical Consideration of the Assessment
of Source Credibility as a Linear Function
of Information Seeking Behavior

An Abstract

The purpose of the research was to determine the degree to which the processes of source credibility evaluation and the seeking of information in order to make source credibility evaluations could be considered interpretations of the same underlying calculus.

The rationale for the study suggested that the calculus underlying both processes dictated linear relationships among those elements that source credibility and information seeking research sought to interpret.

The results of the project showed some support for structural isomorphism between the processes particularly in the assessment of low credibility through information seeking.

A Theoretical Consideration of the Assessment
of Source Credibility as a Linear Function
of Information Seeking Behavior

This research was predicated on the assumption of a detectable linear relationship between the processes of source credibility evaluation and the seeking of information in order to make source credibility evaluations. That is, both processes tend to be interpretations of the same underlying calculus and as such, are properly viewed as being structurally isomorphic (Rudner, 1966).

The rationale for the structural isomorphism position involves the following set of propositions:

(1) There exists a language composed of elements and rules of grammar which is common among subjects of a given population, and in which evaluations of source credibility can be made.

(2) There is a subset of those language elements (adjectives) that can be considered to be linearly related to one another.

(3) The linearity concept is not significantly violated when the adjectives are used as finite boundaries for the overt expression of individual perceptions.

(4) Subjects of a given population will tend to order that material they perceive relevant to the determination of source credibility within boundaries set by the adjectives they commonly employ in making source credibility evaluations.

(5) What subjects will perceive as relevant material can be measured through an examination of their information seeking behavior.

(6) Subjects will selectively seek information and determine its relevance within the context of their language of evaluation.

The purpose of the research was to put under empirical test the above stated rationale for structural isomorphism between the processes of source credibility evaluation and information seeking. The project was divided into four parts.

The first part of the project involved the deriving of a measuring instrument which could be used to assess source credibility. Borrowing from the factor analytic work of Dr. James McCroskey (1972) the authors chose 12 semantic

differential type scales that previous research had indicated to cluster into four dimensions when used by college students to evaluate the source credibility of public figures. These dimensions and their appropriate scales were labeled as follows: Competence (intelligent-unintelligent, trained-untrained, informed-uninformed); Character (good-bad, reliable-unreliable, honest-dishonest); Composure (nervous-poised, tense-relaxed, calm-anxious); Extroversion (meek-aggressive, verbal-quiet, talkative-silent). McCroskey (1972) had found that these four dimensions seemed to explain approximately 59% of his subjects' variance when assessing the source credibility of public figures, many of whom were well known for their political activities. Since the intent of the project was to deal with information seeking, the authors chose to apply the 12 scales to the student assessment of the source credibility of historical political figures for which information was readily available and in a consistent language format. The figures chosen for the initial aspect of the study were: Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, William Jennings Bryan, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Herbert Hoover, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. These historical figures are all essayed in Richard Hofstadter's American Political Tradition (1948) the proposed source of information for later portions of the project.

Part two of the project had 70 students enrolled in a basic communication course at Illinois State University in Spring 1972 employ the 12 source credibility scales in the evaluation of the eight historical figures referenced above. Each subject evaluated each figure in terms of the 12 scales. This portion of the project had as its intent the selection of a set of historical figures, who on the basis of a stimulus of name only, would yield significant differences on each of the four dimensions of source credibility: competence, character, composure and extroversion. A companion study involving the same subjects using the scales provided data for a factor analysis to determine if the subjects

involved in this stage of the project evolved a factor structure similar to the one described by McCroskey (1972) as applying to public figures. Table 1 represents the factor loadings of the 12 scales in terms of the four dimensions of source credibility. Loading in parentheses represents those originally obtained by McCroskey (1972). The results clearly show a high degree of similarity between the two factor structures.

From the source credibility evaluation data for the historical figures factor scores were computed for each of the four dimensions. By employing a treatment by subject analysis of variance on the factor scores it was determined that significant differences existed between the historical figures on each of the four dimensions ($F \geq 2.07$, $p \leq .05$). Since the final step of the project would involve only three of the eight historical figures as stimuli, an attempt was made to select a set which would represent significant differences in terms of all four factor dimensions.

The historical figures selected for the third phase of the project were Andrew Jackson, Thomas Jefferson, and William Jennings Bryan. Again a treatment by subject analysis of variance was employed to insure that the selected set of three historical figures represented significant differences on the four dimensions of source credibility ($F \geq 3.13$, $p \leq .05$). It should be noted that the selection of the historical figures involved a response by the subjects to the stimuli provided by name only. Table 2 represents the means for each figure on each source credibility dimension and the obtained between treatment F ratios.

Given historical figures with what could be assumed to be perceivalbe differences in terms of the four dimensions of source credibility and a common bank of information concerning them, the investigators turned their attention to questions relating to the measurement of structural isomorphism. Needless to say, measuring devices for such a construct were not available and had to be created.

The technique that was created for the project involved the development of a questionnaire-like device (See Appendix A) which would solicit data reflecting the degree to which a particular source credibility scale item was linked to other scale items when a subject could assume that information he considered relevant to source credibility evaluation would be provided. Sixty-three subjects other than those used in the historical figures selection process (but chosen from the same general population) participated in the second part of the project.

Each subject was asked on the questionnaire to respond to all 12 source credibility scale items. For example, for the scale good-bad, he was asked to encode questions whose answers would provide him with information that he could use in marking a particular scale value. He was then asked to indicate what other scales he would fill out assuming that he would be provided answers to his questions. The subject was also given the opportunity of responding that previously asked questions pertaining to a given scale provided sufficient information for making a source credibility evaluation. Thus, the technique allowed both the selective perception of item linkage as well as selective recall of such linkage to influence the measurement of information seeking behavior. The 12 scales were presented to each subject in such a manner as to accomplish randomized ordering across both subjects and scale items. It is important to note that the conceptualization of information seeking was being checked directly via established psychological processes rather than indirect statistical procedures of matrix rotation commonly employed in the establishment of credibility via source evaluation.

Results of these questionnaires were tallied for the purpose of making an across structure comparison between the information seeking and source credibility evaluation data. In order to accomplish this purpose it was necessary to devise an alternative, yet analogous statistical procedure to factor analysis for what

was essentially nominal data. It was important that this process involved the same linear assumptions as factor analysis. The procedure that was developed for the project involved the deviation of a log which assessed the degree to which a particular scale item was linked to other scale items when the subject could assume that the information he sought in order to respond to a particular scale item was provided. These logs could then be used to construct a scale item by a cluster proportion of association matrix similar in format to that evolved by factor analysis. For want of a better term these values were labeled "linkin logs." For N=63 a significant linkin log was determined to be $\geq .52$.

Table 3 represents the linkin logs for the four factors of source credibility represented in Table 1. A comparison of Tables 1 and 3 shows support for the assumption of structural isomorphism between information seeking and source credibility evaluation. Each process evolved four factors with the same content. However, it was the case that in terms of accountable variance the linkin log matrix explained only 51.60 percent as compared with the 59% figure arrived at via factor analysis of source credibility ratings. Whether or not accountable variance was a legitimate basis for comparing information seeking to source credibility evaluation remained an open question. It did seem reasonable to suggest that additional research was needed in order to more adequately evaluate the rationale developed for the structural isomorphism assumed for the two processes.

Part four of the project involved the 63 subjects employed in part three. Here experimenters attempted to answer the questions the subjects asked in part three of the project and then determine the impact of the answers on the manner in which the subjects evaluated source credibility. The three historical political figures selected in part one of the project were used. It will be recalled that these historical figures were selected on the grounds that on the basis of name

only, there existed significant perceivable differences among them on each of the four dimensions of competence, character, composure, and extroversion. additional research on structural isomorphism it was decided that the three historical political figures would constitute levels of one independent variable and that each of the dimensions of source credibility would constitue a dependent variable.

Subjects were asked to evalute the source credibility of the three historical figures under conditions representing three levels of informational stimuli. These conditions constituted a second independent variable for this phase of the project. One condition involved subjects responding to a historical figure in terms of only his name (this represents the condition under which the historical figures were initially chosen from data representing a different but comparable sample). A second condition involved the subject's receiving answers to the questions encoded in part two of the project but without being given the name of the historical figure to whom the information applied. Subjects were given an opportunity to guess the identity of the historical figure in this condition and if they guessed correctly, were eliminated from the sample. This meant that only 42 of the 63 subjects provided data for part four analysis of source credibility evaluation. The third condition represented subjects responding to information about a historical figure given a name prior to reading the material provided. All information concerning the historical figures was taken from Hofstadter's American Political Tradition (1948). Each subject evaluated the source credibility of one of the historical figures under each of the three informational conditions. Source credibility was assessed via the 12 McCroskey scales used in parts one and two of the project. Both the order of the presentation of the information conditions and the scales per condition were completely random, (See Appendix B)

Data stemming from the evaluation of the historical figure source credibility was subjected to a 3X3 Analysis of Variance with repeated measures on each of the two independent variables (Lindquist Type VI design with pseudo replications). The reader is cautioned against an over dependence upon standard uses of AOV procedures in the context of this project. What was really sought in the employment of the analysis of variance routines was an estimate of the various error terms deemed necessary in the detection of structural isomorphism between source credibility evaluation and information seeking processes.

Since the design of the project was perfectly balanced with respect to the number of scores contributing to column and row totals and individual cell means, it was apparent that the data could be analyzed in terms of critical differences Two procedures for calculating critical difference were utilized. It will be recalled that a priori differences were assumed among the three historical figures in terms of each of four dimensions of source credibility. For this reason, the critical value for determining differences between the historical figures disregarding the condition under which information stimuli was presented was computed from a student's t-distribution. Since all other comparisons would involve individual cell means, and what constituted a meaningful comparison for checking structural isomorphism came a posteriori to data collection, it was decided to calculate a second critical difference based on Scheffe's method. Scheffe's method was used because it lends itself to testing the general hypothesis that a linear function of population means is zero and can be used to set confidence limits for such a linear function (Ferguson, 1971). Some concern was expressed over the fact that the Scheffe's approach leads to fewer significant results than other methods of multiple comparisons. For this reason the investigators chose to employ a less rigorous significance level in using the Scheffe procedure ($p \leq .10$) than that used for the assumed a priori comparisons ($p \leq .05$).

This is Scheffe's recommendation (1959). It is important to note that the employment of neither critical difference procedure was dependent upon the finding of significant F ratios in the analysis of variance. In the calculation of the t-test critical difference the historical figure by subject error terms on the AOV tables were utilized. For the calculation of the Scheffe's critical difference, the information condition by historical figure by subject error terms were used.

Given the set of propositions constituting the rationale for structural isomorphism between source credibility evaluation and information seeking processes the investigators listed the following set of expectations for the various critical difference tests.

(1) Disregarding of the nature of the information stimuli provided, subjects could be expected to perceive differences among the historical figures on each of the four dimensions of source credibility.

(2) The clue to what would constitute an indication of structural isomorphism would involve comparisons where in the "information only" condition, the subjects changed the relative ordering of the historical figures supported in the "name only" condition on each of the four dimensions of source credibility.

(3) The magnitude and direction of the differences among the historical figures in the "name/information" condition would be linearly related to the reordering of the historical figures induced in the "information only" condition on each of the four dimensions of source credibility.

Table 4 represents the results of the analysis of variance of the historical figures' perceived source credibility for the competence data. From the results of Table 4 a t-test critical difference (c.d. $\geq$ 1.47. $p \leq .05$) and a Scheffe's critical difference test (c.d. $\geq$ 3.43, $p \leq .10$) were computed. Table 5 represents the means for the competence data. As expected, the subjects were able to perceive differences among the historical figures over the combined information conditions. A significant difference existed between both Bryan (-2.72) and Jackson (-3.10) when both were compared to Jefferson. A comparision of the

means in the "information only' condition to those in the "name only" condition shows that among the three historical figures taken two at a time, information reversed the order for the Bryan-Jackson and the Bryan-Jefferson comparisons. This finding would then predict that in the "name/information" condition Bryan should have less credibility than Jackson and Jefferson more than Jackson and that a significant minus difference should exist at least between Bryan and Jefferson if the concept of structural isomorphism was to be supported. Such a difference (-5.07) between Bryan and Jefferson was found. The data tended to support further structural isomorphism in that Bryan's competence was perceived to be less than Jackson's and Jefferson's more than Jackson's but these differences (-1.71 and +3.36 respectfully) were not found to be significant.

Table 6 represents the results of the analysis of variance of the historical figures' perceived source credibility for the character data. From the results of Table 6 a t-test critical difference (c.d. $\geq$ 1.30, $p \leq .05$) and a Scheffe's critical difference (c.d. $\geq$ 3.46, $p \leq .10$) were computed. Table 7 represents the means for the character data. Again, as expected, the subjects were able to perceive difference among the historical figures for the combined information conditions. As was the case with the competence data, it was found that a significant difference existed between both Bryan (-2.38) and Jackson (-2.31) when both were compared to Jefferson. A comparison of the means in the "information only" condition to those of the "name only" condition showed that among the three historical figures taken two at a time, information reversed the order for the Bryan-Jackson comparison only. This finding would then predict that in the "name/information" condition Jefferson should have more character than both Jackson and Bryan. While such was the case only the difference between Bryan and Jefferson (+3.71) was judged significant though there was trend on the case of the Jackson-Jefferson (+2.79) comparisons.

Table 8 represents the results of the analysis of variance of the historical figures' perceived source credibility for the composure data. From the results of Table 8 a t test critical difference (c.d. $\geq$ 1.31, p $\leq$ .05) and a Scheffe's critical difference test (c.d. $\geq$ 4.32, p $\leq$ .10) was computed. It will be noted that the subjects did not perceive a significant difference among the historical figures over the combined information conditions. There was a trend in the direction of Bryan being perceived differently in terms of composure than both Jackson (+1.07) and Jefferson (+1.14). The Scheffe test showed no significant differences among the individual cell means. The differences were so slight in fact, that no reasonable trends in the data could be extrapolated.

Table 10 represents the results of the analysis of variance of the historical figures' perceived source credibility for the extroversion data. From the results of Table 10 a t-test critical difference (c.d. $\geq$ 1.63, p $\leq$ .05) and a Scheffe's critical difference test (c.d. $\geq$ 4.38, p $\leq$ .10) was computed. A significant difference existed for Bryan (+4.09) and Jackson (+3.09) when both were compared to Jefferson in terms of the combined information conditions. A comparison of the means in the "information only" condition to those in the "name only" condition shows that among the three historical figures taken two at a time information reversed the order for the Bryan-Jefferson and the Jackson-Jefferson comparisons. This finding would then predict that in the "name/information" condition that Bryan should have more perceived extroversion than Jackson and Jefferson less than Jackson and that at least a significant plus difference should exist between Bryan and Jefferson if structural isomorphism was to be supported. Such a difference (+6.71) was found. In addition the minus difference (-5.42) between Jackson and Jefferson was also found to be significant lending even stronger support for the notion of structural isomorphism.

In reviewing the entire project one can see support for the assertion that the processes of source credibility evaluation and information seeking in order to make source evaluations are interpretations of the same underlying calculus. The support, however, is not conclusive. The evidence suggests that subjects can utilize the information they seek to lower credibility linearly at least in the areas of evaluation of competence and extroversion. In these instances, the "name/information" condition produced at least significantly lower means than the corresponding cells for the "name only" condition. When information was linked to Bryan, whose competence in response to his name only was relatively high, there was a significant drop (-4.07) in credibility. For the historical figure Jefferson, whose extroversion was likewise relatively high in response to his name alone, the "name/information" condition produced a significant drop (-4.78) in credibility. The evidence of a linear increase in credibility through information seeking supports only a trend in the predicted direction. It would have been interesting to have run a factor analysis of the subjects' perceptions of source credibility in the "information only" condition. However, the sample size was not deemed sufficient to warrant such action. A content analysis of the questions asked by the subjects might also have led to more support for the concept of isomorphism.

To some extent, the non-conclusive nature of the results that were cited could well be a function of the impact or lack thereof (for composure and, to some extent, character data) of Hofstadter's information. It may be that all the information provided in terms of competence and extroversion was slanted in support of a plus or minus value for a particular historical figure. Thus any question the subject asked received answers that reflected the author's own bias. It might also be that Hofstadter did not provide consistent information with respect to character and composure since his essays by design dealt

only with the public lives of the historical figures. Much more investigation is needed in order to make a clear judgment about this issue. However, it is worth noting that via information seeking, we may be able to evaluate how postdictive ethos is established.

The project in total attempted to address an issue which is directly tied to theory development--namely the nature of the underlying calculus represented by the formulizations. Answers to such an issue will allow the theoretical considerations rather than the data to prescribe the appropriate design and measurement. For example, when a theory predicts a linear relationship, a linear analysis should be employed. The authors fully recognize that much of what has been said in the presentation could well lead to a circularity of argument. Such is the danger of trying to build models, simulations and theoretic formulizations by analogy. Only independent, replicative and predictive empirical research can avoid the problem. For example, one way to induce low credibility in experimental research be to attribute relevant negative information about the source to an information provider with high perceived credibility. The approach used in this project would appear to offer some potential for such research.

Table 1

Factor Loadings for Four Dimensions of Source Credibility for Public Figures

Scale Item	Competence	Character	Composure	Extroversion
1. Intelligent-Unintelligent	.92 (.67)	.15 (.34)	.23 (.17)	.12 (.13)
2. Nervous-Poised	.37 (.07)	.08 (.30)	.81 (.69)	.12 (.35)
3. Tense-Relaxed	.27 (.00)	.03 (.23)	.90 (.72)	.08 (.36)
4. Dishonest-Honest	.01 (.12)	.74 (.76)	.08 (.06)	.15 (.01)
5. Meek-Aggressive	.36 (.15)	.45 (.00)	.07 (.06)	.65 (.69)
6. Calm-Anxious	.10 (.25)	.30 (.24)	.68 (.60)	.20 (.01)
7. Verbal-Quiet	.10 (.11)	.09 (.01)	.02 (.15)	.89 (.77)
8. Untrained-Trained	.84 (.70)	.13 (.36)	.20 (.13)	.02 (.23)
9. Good-Bad	.17 (.22)	.83 (.82)	.00 (.07)	.02 (.11)
10. Uninformed-Informed	.85 (.71)	.17 (.32)	.26 (.06)	.00 (.24)
11. Talkative-Silent	.10 (.17)	.15 (.03)	.01 (.01)	.90 (.75)
12. Reliable-Unreliable	.24 (.21)	.74 (.80)	.07 (.19)	.12 (.07)

Table 2

Mean* Scores for Bryan, Jackson and Jefferson
on Four Dimensions of Source Credibility

Factor	Bryan	Jackson	Jefferson	F-ratio
Competence	15.42	13.72	17.75	30.63
Character	14.27	13.73	15.92	11.03
Composure	13.01	12.07	14.31	7.73
Extroversion	14.76	16.14	15.20	3.46

*A mean score of 12 would represent the theoretical midpoint of continuum for representing each factor.

TABLE 3

Linkin Logs for the Four Factor Solution

Scale Item	Competence	Character	Composure	Extroversion	
1. Intelligence-Unintelligent	.75	.17	.04	.10	
2. Trained-Untrained	.67	.19	.10	.12	
3. Informed-Uninformed	.65	.17	.08	.16	
4. Good-Bad	.15	.04	.02	.09	
5. Reliable-Unreliable	.29	.63	.05	.07	
6. Honest-Dishonest	.11	.76	.03	.06	
7. Nervous-Poised	.09	.02	.70	.27	
8. Tense-Relaxed	.07	.06	.66	.31	
9. Calm-Anxious	.10	.04	.72	.19	
10. Meek-Aggressive	.17	.06	.26	.53	
11. Verbal-Quiet	.17	.09	.24	.62	
12. Talkative-Silent	.16	.06	.20	.66	
Estimate Variance	13.95%	12.50%	13.68%	11.41%	51.60

Table 4

Analysis of Variance for Competence Data

Source of Variance	DF	SUM SOS	MEAN SQ
. Replication	13	224.38	17.26
Infor. Cond.	2	2.21	1.10
Hist. Fig.	2	239.30	119.65
Infor/Hist.	4	175.60	43.90
. Error-Infor.	26	248.24	9.55
Error-Hist.	26	277.81	10.68
Error-Infor/Hist.	52	523.83	10.06
Total	125		

Table 5

Means for Competence

Infor. Con.	Hist. Figures			Row
	Bryan	Jackson	Jefferson	
Name Only	18.36	14.29	17.93	16.86
Infor. Only	15.21	16.43	18.71	16.79
Name/Infor.	14.29	16.00	19.36	16.55
Columns	15.95	15.57	18.67	

*Significant critical difference determined by the t-test, $\geq$ 1.47, p .05
**Significant critical difference determined by the Scheffe test, $\geq$ 3.43, p<.10

Table 6

Analysis of Variance for Character Data

Source of Variance	DF	SUM SQS	MEAN SQ.
Replication	13	199.56	15.35
Information Condition	2	3.16	1.58
Historical Figure	2	154.11	77.06
Information/Historical	4	42.70	10.67
Error-Information	26	290.40	11.16
Error-Historical	26	218.11	8.39
Error-Information/Historical	52	533.08	10.25
Total	125		

Table 7

Means for Character

Information Condition	Historical Figure			Row
	Bryan	Jackson	Jefferson	
Name Only	16.93	15.36	17.64	16.64
Information Only	16.50	16.36	18.21	16.69
Name/Information	14.79	15.71	18.50	16.33
Columns	15.74	15.81	18.12	

*Significant critical difference determined by the t-test, ≥ 1.30, $p < .05$.
**Significant critical difference determined by the Scheffe test, ≥ 3.46, $p < .10$.

Table 8

Analysis of Variance for Composure Data

Source of Variance	DF	SUM SQS	MEAN SQ.
Replication	13	287.02	22.07
Information Conditions	2	41.33	20.67
Historical Figure	2	34.43	17.21
Information/Historical	4	96.10	24.02
Error-Information	26	359.33	13.82
Error-Historical	26	221.57	8.52
Error-Information/Historical	52	832.57	16.01
Total	125		

Table 9

Means for Composure

Information Condition	Historical Figure			Row
	Bryan	Jackson	Jefferson	
Name Only	14.86	12.36	15.00	14.07
Information Only	14.21	12.86	11.43	12.83
Name/Information	12.93	13.57	12.14	12.88
Columns	14.00	12.93	12.86	

*Significant critical difference determined by the t-test, ≥ 1.31, $p < .05$.
**Significant critical difference determined by the Scheffé test, ≥ 4.32, $p < .10$.

Table 10

Analysis of Variance for Extroversion Data

Source of Variance	DF	SUM SQS	MEAN SQ
Replication	13	102.60	7.89
Infor. Cond.	2	3.35	1.67
Hist. Fig.	2	382.92	191.46
Infor/Hist.	4	247.94	61.98
Error-Infor.	26	319.54	12.29
Error-Hist	26	342.63	13.18
Error-Infor/Hist.	52	858.51	16.51
Total	125		

Table 11

Means for Extroversion

Infor. Con.	Hist. Figures			Row
	Bryan	Jackson	Jefferson	
Name Only	16.29	15.71	16.57	16.19
Infor Only	18.50	17.36	12.64	16.17
Name/Infor.	18.50	17.21	11.79	15.83
Columns	17.76	16.76	13.67	

*Significant critical difference determined by the t-test, $\geq$ 1.63, p $<$.05.
**Significant critical difference determined by the Scheffe's test, $\geq$ 4.38, p $<$.10.

REFERENCES

1. Bancroft, T.A. Topics in Intermediate Statistical Methods. Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State University Press, 1968.

2. Ferguson, G.S. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

3. Hamilton, P.R. and Todd, C.G. The Communication Credibility Gap: The Bunker Effect. Unpublished manuscript, Illinois State University, Department of Speech-Communication, 1972.

4. Hofstadter, R. American Political Tradition. New York, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1948.

5. Lindquist, E.F. Design and Analysis of Experiemtns in Psychology and Education, Cambridge, Mass.; Houghton-Mifflin, 1953.

6. McCroskey, J.C. Scales for the Measurement of the Credibility of Public Figures. Unpublished manuscript, Illinois State University Department of Speech-Communication, 1972.

7. Rudner, R.S. Philosophy of Social Science. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

8. Scheffe's, H. The Analysis of Variance. New York, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1959.

9. Winer, B.J. Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Appendix A

NAME_____

INSTRUCTIONS

In the following packet you will be asked to do 4 things. At the top of each page you will be asked to complete a semantic differential on an unknown source of communication. Since the source is unknown, it may be difficult for you to make an evaluation without some information. We are interested in what type of information you need, what kind of questions you would ask in order to give a source of communication a specific rating. Write down the questions you would need answered in order to make an evaluation. It may be that you do not need any new information. You may have asked all the necessary questions elsewhere in this packet. In that event, mark the appropriate blank where it says "no new information needed." This is the third thing. The fourth thing for you to mark is Part B. In this part, there will be several other evaluation scales listed. You do not need to supply a rating for these scales but just indicate (by a check mark in the blank directly in front of the scale) whether or not you could make such an evaluation based on the information you sought in the form of your questions in Part A. The 4 things you have to do, then, are:

1) Examine carefully the scale in Part A.

2) Decide whether or not you need new information to evaluate an unknown source on the scale.

3) Seek the new information you need in the form of a question.

4) Determine whether or not the information you sought would also help you in completing the other scales listed.

Complete the following pages on the assumption that they apply to your evaluation of Unknown Historical-Political Figures.

Part A: Please indicate by writing a question or questions the kind of information you would need in order to evaluate the credibility of an unknown source of communication on the following scale.

Reliable .___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Unreliable

If you feel that questions that you have asked in other sections or this questionnaire would yeild sufficient information for you to mark the above scale, please check the following:

_____ no new information needed

Your question:

Part B: If you wrote questions in Part A, would you please indicate if the information sought would help you in marking any of the following scales. Place a check in the blank directly in front of whatever scale you feel applies.

_____: Trained-Untrained

_____: Good-Bad

_____: Calm-Anxious

_____: Uninformed-Informed

_____: Tense-Relaxed

_____: Verbal-Quiet

_____: Aggressive-Meek

_____: Talkative-Silent

_____: Honest-Dishonest

_____: Intelligent-Unintelligent

_____: Nervous-Poised

Part A: Please indicate by writing a question or questions the kind of information you would need in order to evaluate the credibility of an unknown source of communication on the following scale:

Honest :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Dishonest

If you feel that questions that you have asked in other sections of this questionnarie would yield sufficient information for you to mark the above scale, please check the following:

_____ no new information needed

Your Question:

Part B: If you wrote questions in Part A, would you please indicate if the information shought would help you in marking any of the following scales. Place a check in the blank directly in front of whatever scale you feel applies.

_____: Uninformed-Informed

_____: Aggressive-Meek

_____: Nervous-Poised

_____: Intelligent-Unintelligent

_____: Tense-Relaxed

_____: Talkative-Silent

_____: Good-Bad

_____: Calm-Anxious

_____: Verbal-Quiet

_____: Trained-Untrained

_____: Reliable-Unreliable

Part A: Please indicate by writing a question or questions the kind of information you would need in order to evaluate the credibility of an unknown source of communication on the following scale:

Good :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Bad

If you feel that questions that you have asked in other sections of this questionnaire would yield sufficient information for you to mark the above scale, please check the following:

_____ no new information needed

Your Question:

Part B: If you wrote questions in Part A, would you please indicate if the information sought would help you in marking any of the following scales. Place a check in the blank directly in front of whatever scale you feel applies.

_____: Talkative-Silent

_____: Aggressive-Meek

_____: Trained-Untrained

_____: Tense-Relaxed

_____: Uninformed-Informed

_____: Reliable-Unreliable

_____: Intelligent-Unintelligent

_____: Calm-Anxious

_____: Honest-Dishonest

_____: Nervous-Poised

_____: Verbal-Quiet

Part A: Please indicate by writing a question or questions the kind of information you would need in order to evaluate the credibility of an unknown source of communication on the following scale:

Verbal :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Quiet

If you feel that questions that you have asked in other sections of this questionnaire would yield sufficient information for you to mark the above scale, please check the following:

_____ no new information needed

Your Question:

Part B: If you wrote questions in Part A, would you please indicate if the information sought would help you in marking any of the following scales. Place a check in the blank directly in front of whatever scale you feel applies.

_____: Nervous-Poised

_____: Honest-Dishonest

_____: Intelligent-Unintelligent

_____: Talkative-Silent

_____: Aggressive-Meek

_____: Calm-Anxious

_____: Trained-Untrained

_____: Tense-Relaxed

_____: Good-Bad

_____: Uninformed-Informed

_____: Reliable-Unreliable

Part A: Please indicate by writing a question or questions the kind of information you would need in order to evaluate the credibility of an unknown source of communication on the following scale:

Verbal :____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Quiet

If you feel that questions that you have asked in other sections of this questionnaire would yield sufficient information for you to mark the above scale, please check the following:

_____ no new information needed

Your Question:

Part B: If you wrote questions in Part A, would you please indicate if the information sought would help you in marking any of the following scales. Place a check in the blank directly in front of whatever scale you feel applies.

_____: Nervous-Poised

_____: Honest-Dishonest

_____: Intelligent-Unintelligent

_____: Talkative-Silent

_____; Aggressive-Meek

_____: Calm-Anxious

_____: Trained-Untrained

_____: Tense-Relaxed

_____: Good-Bad

_____: Uninformed-Informed

_____: Reliable-Unreliable

Part A: Please indicate by writing a question or questions the kind of information you would need in order to evaluate the credibility of an unknown source of communication on the following scale:

Aggressive :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Meek

If you feel that questions that you have asked in other sections of this questionnaire would yeild sufficient information for you to mark the above scale, please check the following:

_____no new information needed

Your Question:

Part B: If you wrote questions in Part A, would you please indicate if the information sought would help you in marking any of the following scale. Place a check in the blank directly in front of whatever scale you feel applies.

_____: Verbal-Quiet

_____: Good-Bad

_____: Reliable-Unreliable

_____: Calm-Anxious

_____: Informed-Uninformed

_____: Talkative-Silent

_____: Honest-Dishonest

_____: Tense-Relaxed

_____: Intelligent-Unintelligent

_____: Nervous-Poised

_____: Trained-Untrained

Part A: Please indicate by writing a question or questions the kind of information you would need in order to evaluate the credibility of an known source of communicalton on the following scale:

Talkative :___:___:____:___:___:___:___: Silent

If you feel that questions that you have asked in other sections of this questionnaire would yield sufficient information for you to mark the above scale, please check the following:

_____ no new information needed

Your Question:

Part B: If you wrote questions in Part A, would you please indicate if the information sought would help you in marking any of the following scales. Place a check in the blank directly in front of whatever scale you feel applies.

_____: Reliable-Unreliable

_____: Nervous-Poised

_____: Informed-Uninformed

_____: Honest-Dishonest

_____: Aggressive-Meek

_____: Verbal-Quiet

_____: Trained-Untrained

_____: Calm-Anxious

_____: Good-Bad

_____: Tense-Relaxed

_____: Intelligent-Unintelligent

Part A: Please indicate by writing a question or questions the kind of information you would need in order to evaluate the credibility of an unknown source of communication on the following scale:

Nervous :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Poised

If you feel that questions that you have asked in other sections of this questionnaire would yield sufficient information for you to mark the above scale, please check the following:

_____ no new information needed

Your Question:

Part B: If you wrote questions in Part A, would you please indicate if the information sought would help you in making any of the following scales. Place a check in the blank directly in front of whatever scale you feel applies.

_____: Reliable-Unreliable

_____: Aggressive-Meek

_____: Talkative-Silent

_____: Trained-Untrained

_____: Honest-Dishonest

_____: Good-Bad

_____: Calm-Anxious

_____: Verbal-Quiet

_____: Uninformed-Informed

_____: Tense-Relaxed

_____: Intelligent-Unintelligent

Part A: Please indicate by writing a question or questions the kind of information you would need in order to evaluate the credibility of an unknown source of communicaiton on the following scale:

Calm :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Anxious

If you feel that questions that you have asked in other sections of this questionnaire would yield sufficient information for you to mark the above scale, please check the following:

_____ no new information needed

Your Question:

Part B: If you wrote questions in Part A, would you please indicate if the information sought would help you in marking any of the following scales. Place a check in the blank directly in front of whatever scale you feel applies.

_____: Uninformed-Informed

_____: Verbal-Quiet

_____: Honest-Dishonest

_____: Intelligent-Unintelligent

_____: Tense-Relaxed

_____: Good-Bad

_____: Trained-Untrained

_____: Reliable-Unreliable

_____: Talkative-Silent

_____: Nervous-Poised

_____: Aggressive-Meek

Part A: Please indicate by writing a question or questions the kind of information you would need in order to evaluate the credibility of an unknown source of communication on the following scale:

Tense :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Relaxed

If you feel that questions that you have asked in other sections of this questionnaire would yield sufficient information for you to mark the above scale, please check the following:

_____ no new information needed

Your Question:

Part B: If you wrote questions in Part A, would you please indicate if the information sought would help you in marking any of the following scales. Place a check in the blank directly in front of whatever scale you feel applies.

_____: Reliable-Unreliable

_____: Nervous-Poised

_____: Trained-Untrained

_____: Aggressive-Meek

_____: Verbal-Quiet

_____: Uninformed-Informed

_____: Honest-Dishonest

_____: Calm-Anxious

_____: Talkative-Silent

_____: Intelligent-Unintelligent

_____: Good-Bad

Part A: Please indicate by writing a question or questions the kind of information you would need in order to evaluate the credibility of an unknown source of communication on the following scale:

Trained :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Untrained

If you feel that questions that you have asked in other sections of this questionnaire would yield sufficient information for you to mark the above scale, please check the following:

_____ no new information needed

Your Question:

Part B: If you wrote questions in Part A, would you please indicate if the information sought would help you in marking any of the following scales. Place a check in the blank directly in front of whatever scale you feel applies.

_____: Talkative-Silent

_____: Nervous-Poised

_____: Intelligent-Unintelligent

_____: Calm-Anxious

_____: Honest-Dishonest

_____: Aggressive-Meek

_____: Good-Bad

_____: Tense-Relaxed

_____: Uninformed-Informed

_____: Reliable-Unreliable

_____: Verbal-Quiet

Part A: Please indicate by writing a question or questions the kind of information you would need in order to evaluate the credibility of an unknown source of communication on the following scale:

Uninformed :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Informed

If you feel that questions that you have asked in other sections of this questionnaire would yield sufficient information for you to mark the above scale, please check the following:

_____ no new information needed

Your Question:

Part B: If you wrote questions in Part A, would you please indicate if the information sought would help you in marking any of the following scales. Place a check in the blank directly in front of whatever scale you feel applies.

_____: Tense-Relaxed

_____: Good-Bad

_____: Verbal-Quiet

_____: Trained-Untrained

_____: Nervous-Poised

_____: Honest-Dishonest

_____: Intelligent-Unintelligent

_____: Reliable-Unreliable

_____: Calm-Anxious

_____: Talkative-Silent

_____: Aggressive-Meek

Part A: Please indicate by writing a question or questions the kind of information you would need in order to evaluate the credibility of an unknown source of communication on the following scale:

Intelligent :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Unintelligent

If you feel that questions that you have asked in other sections of this questionnaire would yield sufficient information for you to mark the above scale, please check the following:

_____ no new information needed

Your Question:

Part B: If you wrote questions in Part A, would you please indicate if the information sought would help you in marking any of the following scales. Place a check in the blank directly in front of whatever scale you feel applies.

_____: Nervous-Poised

_____: Verbal-Quiet

_____: Honest-Dishonest

_____: Trained-Untrained

_____: Tense-Relaxed

_____: Talkative-Silent

_____: Good-Bad

_____: Uninformed-Informed

_____: Calm-Anxious

_____: Aggressive-Meek

_____: Reliable-Unreliable

APPENDIX B

_____
Your Name

In this booklet you will be asked to rate three historical-political figures. For one such figure you will be asked to respond to his name only. For another, to information concerning the figure, but you will be given the name of the person you are rating, though you may guess at his identity. For a third figure you will be given both his name and information about him. In all cases, you are asked to fill out a set of semantic differential type scales concerning your evaluation of the historical-political figure as a source of communication

The following explains how to use semantic differential type scales in case you have never responded to them.

First of all, a semantic differential is two opposite adjectives divided by seven spaces.

Good :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Bad

You mark it by placing an X in the space that most nearly represents your opinion. For example, if you were asked to rate President Nixon on the above scale and you feel he is very bad you might mark the scale like this--depending on how strongly you feel:

Good :___:___:___:___: X or X or X : Bad

However, if you are a strong Nixon fan you might mark the scale like this, again depending on how strongly you feel:

Good : X or X or X :___:___:___:___: Bad

If you have no opinion on the matter, you may choose to mark the middle space.

PLEASE DO NOT CONFER WITH OTHER MEMBERS OF THE CLASS UNTI ALL SCALES HAVE BEEN COMPLETED. THANK YOU.

After reading the information provided, please evaluate the unknown historical-political figure as a source of communication.

Intelligent :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Unintelligent

Nervous :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Poised

Tense :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Relaxed

Dishonest :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Honest

Meek :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Aggressive

Calm :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Anxious

Verbal :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Quiet

Untrained :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Trained

Good :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Bad

Uninformed :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Informed

Talkative :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Silent

Reliable :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Unreliable

It may be that the information you were provided allowed you to guess correctly the identity of the unknown historical figure. Would you please indicate theperson you think the information might apply to:

_____

Please evaluate the following historical-political figure as a course of communication:

William Jennings Bryan

Intelligent	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Unintelligent
Nervous	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Poised
Tense	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Relaxed
Dishonest	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Honest
Meek	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Aggressive
Calm	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Anxious
Verbal	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Quiet
Untrained	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Trained
Good	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Bad
Uninformed	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Informed
Talkative	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Silent
Reliable	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Unreliable

Please evaluate the following historical-political figure as a source of communication:

Thomas Jefferson

Intelligent :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Unintelligent

Nervous :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Poised

Tense :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Relaxed

Dishonest :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Honest

Meek :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Aggressive

Calm :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Anxious

Verbal :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Quiet

Untrained :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Trained

Good :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Bad

Uninformed :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Informed

Talkative :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Silent

Reliable :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Unreliable